

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action electronically delivered on May 2, 2007 ("Office Action"). Applicants amend Claims 27-28, 34, 42-43, 49, 57-58, and 64. As described below, Applicants believe all claims to be allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner rejects Claims 27-28, 34, 42-43, 49, 57-58 and 64 due to informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 27-28, 34, 42-43, 49, 57-58, and 64 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions and requests that the objections to Claims 27-28, 34, 42-43, 49, 57-58 and 64 be withdrawn.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 27-32, 34, 42-47, 49, 57-62, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,092,194 issued to Touboul ("*Touboul*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,966 issued to Hayman et al. ("*Hayman*").

Regarding independent Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that *Touboul* fails to disclose at least the features of Claim 27 of "providing, on a workstation, a pre-set list of applications permitted to run on the workstation and a list of one or more computer resources on the workstation that are not accessible to unspecified applications" and "receiving at the filter a request for access generated by an unspecified application downloaded to the workstation from a source external to the workstation, the request for access identifying a computer resource resident on the workstation to which the unspecified application seeks access", and "determining, by the filter on the workstation, whether the requested computer resource is on the list of one or more computer resources that are not accessible to unspecified applications."

The Response to Arguments on page 2 of the Office Action asserts that the internal network security system 110 of *Touboul* is a workstation having these features, but this is incorrect. The Office Action indicates that the non-hostile Downloadables described in column 4, lines 29-33 *Touboul* teach the "pre-set list of applications permitted to run on the workstation..." recited in independent Claim 27. The Office Action further asserts that the

List Of Operations Deemed Potentially Hostile described in column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 4 of *Touboul* teaches the “list of one or more computer resources on the workstation that are not accessible to unspecified applications.” The List Of Operations Deemed Potentially Hostile described in *Touboul* is a list of operations that a code scanner 325 may search for when decomposing code of a specific Downloadable to determine if the specific Downloadable is potentially hostile. However, the List Of Operations described by *Touboul* is not a list of one or more computer resources on a workstation that are not accessible to unspecified applications as claimed in Claim 27. Further, the List Of Operations described by *Touboul* is not used to determine whether a computer resource requested by an unspecified application is one a list of one ore more computer resources that are not accessible to unspecified applications. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the aforementioned features of independent Claim 27 are not taught or suggested by *Touboul*.

Applicants further submit that *Hayman* also fails to teach or suggest these features. *Hayman* discloses a security system for a computer system that imposes limitations on who has access to the computer system and to exactly what operations and data. *Hayman* further discloses breaking up computer functions into required privileges and assigning different privileges to each user depending on the particular job which that user is to do the computer system. Thus, *Hayman* describes a system that determines the permissibility of accessing user-requested functions on a user-by-user basis. Applicants submit that *Hayman* contains no teaching or suggestion of the aforementioned features of independent Claim 27. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 27 is allowable, as are the claims depending therefrom.

Independent Claims 42 and 57 contain features that are analogous to those discussed with respect to independent Claim 27. Therefore, for analogous reasons as those discussed with respect to independent Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 42 and 57 are allowable, as are the claims depending therefrom.

Claims 33, 48, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Touboul* in view *Hayman* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,523 issued to Hind et al. (“*Hind*”). Claims 33, 48, and 63 are dependent upon independent Claims 27, 42, and 57, respectively. As discussed above, *Touboul* in view *Hayman* fail to teach the aforementioned features of independent Claims 27, 42, and 57. Applicant respectfully submits that *Hind* also fails to teach or suggest these features. Hind describes a method for

allowing a dynamic applet to access a server that is different than the server from which the dynamic applet was downloaded. However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Hayman* fails to disclose the aforementioned features of independent Claims 27, 42, and 57. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 33, 48, and 63 are also allowable

CONCLUSION


Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call its attorney at the number listed below.

No fee is believed to be due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Luke K. Pedersen
Reg. No. 45,003
(214) 953-6809

Date: 8/2/07

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No.: **05073**